Applicant: Stanley J. Kostoff, II et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 04838-060001

Serial No.: 09/632,775 Filed: August 4, 2000

Page : 2 of 3

The invention sends a shorter and more efficient response, but one that is still capable of informing the transmitter of the receipt (or other status) of the frame. The claims describe the response as follows:

transmitting on the transmission medium a second frame transmission including information from the first frame transmission other than the destination address, the information from the first frame transmission occupying fewer bits than the destination address but being sufficiently unique to the first frame transmission as to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission.

The examiner's new reference, Gleeson, does not come even close to disclosing the invention. Gleeson is not concerned with transmission of a response from a receiving station back to a transmitting station. What Gleeson teaches is a way of compressing the headers of packets being transmitted over a TCP/IP "connection". After a TCP/IP connection has been established between two stations, a series of packets may be transmitted in <u>one direction</u> from a transmitter to a receiver. Because certain of the header fields (e.g., fields 1508-1524 in FIG. 15) will not change for the duration of the connection -- e.g., because the same transmitter is sending all the packets to the same receiver, Gleeson describes a scheme whereby these header fields are shrunk by replacing them with a token. A layer underneath the TCP/IP layer keeps a table that relates the tokens to the original header fields, and when a packet is received the token is replaced with the original header field before being delivered to the TCP/IP layer. This is described in Gleeson, beginning at col. 15, line 65, and extending through col. 16, line 39.

There are at least two enormous differences between Gleeson and the invention of claims 1 and 4.

First, all of the Gleeson token transmissions (the ones in which a token replaces constant header fields) take place in one direction, from a transmitter to a receiver. None of the Gleeson token transmissions is a response from a receiver back to a transmitter, as required by the claims.

Second, the tokens in Gleeson are not based on information from another transmission, as required by the claims ("second frame transmission including information from the first frame transmission"). The Gleeson tokens are an arbitrary number ("can be <u>any</u> unique field", Gleeson, col. 16, line 53).

Applicant: Stanley J. Kostoff, II et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 04838-060001

Serial No.: 09/632,775 Filed: August 4, 2000

Page : 3 of 3

Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on one or the other of claims 1 and 4, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

G. Roger Lee

Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C. 225 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110

Telephone: (617) 542-5070 Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21174968.doc